

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**AT BECKLEY**

MARSHALL LOUIS RATLIFF,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:19-cv-00725

SOUTHERN REGIONAL JAIL and  
LARRY WARDEN,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Pending are Plaintiff's Application to Proceed without Prepayment of Fees [Doc. 5] and Amended Complaint [Doc. 7]. This action was previously referred to United States Magistrate Judge Omar J. Aboulhosn for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn filed his PF&R on November 5, 2019 [Doc. 8]. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn recommended that the Court deny Plaintiff's Application to Proceed without Prepayment of Fees, dismiss the Amended Complaint, and remove the matter from the Court's docket.

The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (emphasis added) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made*."). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v.*


*De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (noting parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge’s findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn’t require de novo review absent objection.”); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on November 22, 2019. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**Doc. 8**], **DENIES** the Application to Proceed without Prepayment of Fees [**Doc. 5**], **DISMISSES** the Amended Complaint [**Doc. 7**], and **ORDERS** the matter stricken.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTERED: December 2, 2019



  
Frank W. Volk  
United States District Judge